

**REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in granting the interview that was conducted on July 29, 2008. In view of the Examiner's comments, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4 and presents herewith new dependant claims 8-14. No new matter is added by this amendment. Claims 1-14 are pending.

In the Office Action,<sup>1</sup> the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0019844 to Kurowski et al. ("Kurowski") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0268293 to Woodgeard ("Woodgeard").

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Woodgeard fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kurowski as acknowledged in the Office Action. For example, Woodgeard does not teach or suggest at least that "the superior computer does not act as an inferior computer," as recited in claim 1.

As discussed during the interview, Woodgeard discloses "[t]o execute a grid node application on a grid node, nodes which can provide appropriate computing resources must first be identified, and the grid node application must be submitted to the identified node(s) as a job for execution. Rather than using a centralized resource manager and/or job submission manager, the grid as it exists today uses a decentralized approach, where each grid node provides: grid services which support resource discovery, job submission, and other functionality, and a grid client which uses

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

the grid services provided by other grid nodes” (repetition of the words “grid node” after the words “grid node” omitted). Woodgeard Paragraph [0018] (reference numbers removed for clarity).

During the interview, the Examiner explained that he interpreted the above portion of Woodgeard to mean that at one point in time, client 105A in Figure 1 may be superior to client 105B in Figure 1, but also that at another point in time client 105B in Figure 1 may be superior to client 105A in Figure 1. In other words, a computer that is superior at one point in time may act as an inferior computer at another point in time.

While Applicant does not necessarily agree with this interpretation, claim 1, as amended, recites that the “superior computer does not act as an inferior computer.” As such, the Office Action’s interpretation of Woodgeard is in direct opposition to the feature of claim 1. The Examiner stated that claim 1, if amended to overcome this interpretation of Woodgeard, would receive favorable consideration.

Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established in view of Kurowski and Woodgeard with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 4, while of a different scope than claim 1, is allowable for reasons at least similar to those discussed above for claim 1. Claims 2-3 and 5-14 are allowable over the prior art at least due to their dependencies on each of allowable independent claims 1 or 4. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allow claims 1-14.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 12, 2008

By:  *Travis Banta*  
Travis Banta  
Reg. No. 60,498  
(202) 408-4000